

REMARKS:

The examiner appears to have withdrawn the prior rejection and substituted two new rejections.

First, claims 1–31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Sekizawa in view of Rezvani. In addition, claims 1–31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Rezvani.

Turning first to the combination of Sekizawa and Rezvani, the examiner acknowledges that Sekizawa does not explicitly disclose an application layer message document including a unique machine name and password combination in a hypertext format. The examiner asserts that Rezvani teaches this limitation. Respectfully, applicant disagrees. The examiner refers to sections 55–58, 77–79, and 86–93 for this teaching.

First of all, in Rezvani, in addition to the machines, there is a monitoring module through which the machines or devices are connected to the remote server. Rezvani shows the monitoring module 28 in figures 1 and 2 as part of the overall system and illustrates its operation in figure 9. It is clear from these figures that the actual machines or devices are connected to the monitoring module. This is explicitly shown in figures 1 and 2 and shown in the flow chart in figure 9.

Significantly, the only mention in Rezvani of an ID and password is in connection with the monitoring module. Applicant has searched carefully through Rezvani and nowhere is there any suggestion that the machine itself has the combination of an identifier and password. Admittedly, the machine may have an identifier, but there is not a word about connecting a remote machine to a central system by using a message generator that creates

messages using a unique machine name and password as set forth in claim 1. In Rezvani, where multiple machines, such as the multiple cameras shown in figure 10, are connected to a remote server through a monitoring module, there is only a single password for the monitoring module and consequently there is no password protection for the individual machines as required in claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1–9 are patentable for this reason alone. Also note that this distinction overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Rezvani.

Regarding claim 5, since there is no suggestion in Rezvani that the machines have a unique machine name and password, there is no memory in the central system for storing the unique machine name and password. This is more than a minor difference since Rezvani is incapable of authenticating the individual machines because they do not have passwords. A machine could therefore be replaced in Rezvani without the system being aware of it. In applicant's claimed invention, a machine could be replaced only if its password were known.

With regard to claim 10, the examiner argues that the limitations are substantially the same as in claim 1 but notes that the memory for storing a schedule and associated limitations are not present in claim 1. In the previous response, applicant pointed out that Sekizawa did not show or suggest a receiver activated for a pre-determined time after the message generator is activated for receiving messages from the central server. Applicant noted that this limitation was not found in Mache and notes now that it is not found in Rezvani. The examiner has not even suggested that this limitation, which appears in claim 10 but not in claim 1, is found in Rezvani and has not responded to applicant's argument that it is also missing from Sekizawa. For this reason alone, claims 10–16 are patentable.

The examiner has not even suggested that Sekizawa and Rezvani show receiving a schedule from a central system as set forth in claim 14 and therefore applicant is uncertain as to whether this limitation has been considered.

With regard to claim 17, applicant has amended claim 17 to make it clear that the apparatus includes a listener for receiving a schedule from a central system in addition to the memory for storing the schedule from the central system. In Rezvani, the only mention of scheduling is a mention that messages may be sent periodically. Applicant doubts that this contemplated anything as versatile as a scheduler as claimed, but certainly there is no suggestion in Sekizawa or Rezvani that a schedule would be received from the central system and that the apparatus would include a scheduler for activating the message generator according to the stored schedule for temporarily creating a two-way connection.

Claim 19 in which this limitation originally appeared has been cancelled.

With regard to claim 20, there is nothing in either Sekizawa or Rezvani corresponding to applicant's limitations that each message includes a message identifier. In applicant's system, the message identifier permits the system to associate messages sent from the server to the system or from the system to the server with responses. There is no mention in Sekizawa or Rezvani of anything corresponding to applicant's message identifier.

Claim 21 also provides that each received message includes a message identifier and that the responsive message include a message identifier corresponding to the message identifier of one received message. Again, this permits the messages and responses to be associated and is nowhere suggested or described by Sekizawa or Rezvani.

The examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation but instead has lumped claims 17–31 together with claims 1–16 in which this limitation is not present and therefore applicant is uncertain whether this limitation has even been considered.

This feature is further set forth in claim 22 in which the step of reconciling the responsive message with the logged request is set forth. There is nothing in Sekizawa or Rezvani corresponding to this limitation and again, the examiner has not specifically commented on the limitation and therefore applicant is uncertain as to whether it has been considered.

A number of additional limitations appear in claims 17–31 that the examiner has not mentioned including as set forth in claim 24 detecting a fault at an asset requiring interactivity and sending one or more polling messages to the server in response to the fault.

The examiner has not suggested that Sekizawa or Rezvani show or suggest the limitation in claim 25 of sending one or more polling messages at a second interval shorter than the predetermined interval.

The examiner has not suggested and applicant believes that Sekizawa and Rezvani do not show or suggest that the second predetermined interval is set by the server. In fact as already discussed, Rezvani and Sekizawa show nothing suggesting that any scheduling is done by the server.

Applicant respectfully submits that for the reasons discussed, the claims are patentable over Rezvani individually and over the combination of Sekizawa and Rezvani. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: December 19, 2005

Stephen B. Salai, Registration No. 26,990
HARTER, SECREST & EMERY LLP
1600 Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, New York 4604
Telephone: 585-232-6500
Fax: 585-232-2152